

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KASEY CARLSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHIPPEWA VALLEY TECHNICAL COLLEGE,

Defendant.

ORDER

16-cv-840-jdp

In response to the court's direction at the April 12, 2018 motion hearing (dkt. 53), plaintiff has filed ex parte and in camera the documents for which she is claiming privilege. Dkt. 56. In the cover submission, counsel for plaintiff reports that: two documents were listed on the privilege log in error and do not actually exist; plaintiff voluntarily will produce certain other documents with no conditions; plaintiff will produce certain other documents without waiving the work product privilege; and plaintiff is withdrawing her claim of work product privilege for certain other documents but is maintaining Brenda Scheurer's claim of attorney-client privilege for these documents.

I have read all of the documents for which plaintiff (or Scheurer) continues to claim privilege. The claim of privilege is well taken for each of these documents. Notwithstanding the number of documents for which plaintiff and Scheurer are claiming privilege, there is very little information being withheld. First, there is a great deal of overlap and duplication between the documents; second, most of the emails consist of a sentence or two of content buried in strata of boilerplate headers, legal warnings and disclaimers. But the small amount of content qualifies as attorney work product, attorney-client privileged information, or both.

Plaintiff promptly shall turn over the documents she has volunteered to turn over, but she need not turn over any of the others.

Entered this 3rd day of May, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge